

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 79 - 84 have been deleted and new claims 85 and 86 have been added to define applicant's invention. Applicant submits that the changes to these claims make explicit that which applicant believed to be already implicit.

Claims 2-16, 20, 24, 28-32, 34, 39, 40, 56-69, 71-78 and 82-83 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Greening ("Greening," U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0013009) in view of Harvey ("Harvey," U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0059379) in view of Goldstein ("Goldstein," U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0032115). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, with reference to new claims 85 and 86.

Furthermore, claims 18 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Greening in view of Harvey in view of Goldstein ("Goldstein," U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2001/0032115) in view of Masi ("Masi," U.S. Patent No. 6,105,001). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that features defined in claims 85 and 86 are not taught, suggested or disclosed by either Greening, Harvey and Goldstein, nor does the combination of those references teach, suggest or disclose the missing features of applicant's claims 85 and 86. Since these features are missing from each of Greening, Harvey and Goldstein, the combination of those references cannot render the claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The missing features in applicant's claim 85 include, *inter alia*, an internet site which provides a "first search result" and a "second search result" in response to "search criteria." The "search criteria" represents "at least one personal trait" and "at least one category of personal preference information." The missing features further include "prompting" users of the internet site to become "members" by exchanging information with a data provider. The "exchanging" includes requests sent from the provider, and "personal trait information" and "personal preference information" sent from the users. Moreover, the "personal trait information" includes a "plurality of characteristics" of the users and the "personal preference information" includes "preferences of the users associated with other people," "preferences of at least one brand of good or service," and "degrees to which the at least one brand of good or service are preferred." Further, the missing features include providing the "first search result" and the "second search result." The first search result includes "includes at least some of available personal preference

information from at least one member that corresponds directly to the search criteria.” The second search result includes “personal preference information from the at least one member” and that is at least in part “included in the first search result.” The second search result further includes “personal preference information from the at least one member or at least one other member and that is not included in the first search result.”

Applicant’s new claim 86 includes similar missing features.

Instead of teaching these features, Greening describes a system and method for predicting the interest of a user “based on that user’s behavioral or preferential similarities to other users, to objective archetypes formed by assembling items satisfying a search criterion, a market segment profile, a demographic profile or a psychographic profile” (see, for example, Abstract, paragraphs [0014]-[0021], [0035], [0036], [0039], [0040], [0041], [0043] and [0052]). Greening creates a personalized experience or makes recommendations based on an individual’s “personal tastes” (paragraph [0014]). Accordingly, the individual to whom recommendations are made is determined, such as described above. Greening attempts to analyze the individuals in order to find like-minded people. Conversely, applicant’s claims 85 and 86 do not define features that attempt to understand the searcher in order to identify like-minded individuals. Instead, applicant’s claims 85 and 86 provides first and second search results. As noted above, the “first search result” includes “at least some of available personal preference information from at least one member that corresponds directly to the search criteria.” The “second search result” includes “personal preference information from the at least one member” and that is at least in part “included in the first search result.”

Greening does not teach, suggest or disclose this feature, nor does Greening teach, suggest or disclose the combination of features described above with reference to applicant’s claims 85 and 86.

The missing features defined in claims 85 and 86 are also not taught, suggested or disclosed by either Harvey or Goldstein. Thus, the combination of those references cannot teach, suggest or disclose the applicant’s invention defined in claims 85 and 86. Harvey is cited by the Examiner for teaching an individual searching demographic databases of users or members. Harvey is also cited for disclosing providers of goods and services, and for utilizing message boards. Goldstein is cited by the Examiner for teaching tracking brand preference of users and

brand information from providers of goods or services, and for disclosing collecting personal information from new members.

Neither Harvey nor Goldstein teaches, suggests or discloses the missing features of claims 85 and 86, including a “first search result” that includes “at least some of available personal preference information from at least one member that corresponds directly to the search criteria,” and a “second search result” that includes “personal preference information from the at least one member” and that is at least in part “included in the first search result.”


Thus, for the above reasons, even if one were to combine Greening, Harvey and Goldstein, as the Examiner has done, applicant’s claims 85 and 86 still would not be taught. Therefore, applicant submits that claims 85 and 86 are allowable over the combination of Greening, Harvey and Goldstein, and are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 2-78 depend directly or indirectly from claims 85 or 86, respectively, and are patentable for the same reasons as well as because of the combination of features in those claims with the features set forth in the claim(s) from which they depend. Further, Masi, which is cited by the Examiner for teaching rewarding users for recruiting new members, does not provide elements of applicant’s claims 85 or 86 that are missing from the combined teachings of Greening, Harvey and Goldstein.

For the reasons set forth above, applicant respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance, for which action is earnestly solicited.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON November 21, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



Joel J. Felber
Registration No.: 59,642
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

DAM:JJF:ck:jl